

REMARKS

Amendments to the Claims

Claims 13, 16 and 17 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim that which Applicants regard as their invention. Support for the amendments can be found, for example, on page 12, lines 3-16.

Rejection of Claims 13-20 Under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

Claims 13-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that the Applicants regard as their invention.

Specifically, the Examiner states that the recitation of "the gene" in Claim 13 has insufficient antecedent basis. Applicants have amended Claim 13 as the Examiner has suggested, thereby obviating the rejection. Applicants note that Claims 14-20 depend on Claim 13, and thus the rejection of these claims is also obviated.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 13-20 Under 35 U.S.C. §112, First Paragraph

Claims 13-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter that was not described in the Specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors had possession of the claimed invention at the time of filing. Specifically, the Examiner indicates that "chimeric receptor" encompasses both transmembrane and non-transmembrane receptors and the "appropriate ligand" can be something other than a hormone ligand.

In order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended Claim 13 to recite that the chimeric receptor is a non-transmembrane receptor. Additionally, Applicants have amended Claim 13 to recite a "hormone binding domain" and "an appropriate hormone". These amendments should not be construed to indicate that Applicants acquiesce in the rejection. In view of these amendments, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 13-20 Under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

Claims 13-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. The Examiner states that the Specification does not reasonably provide enablement for the full scope of the claims.

In order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended Claim 13 to recite a "non-transmembrane receptor", a "hormone binding domain" and "an appropriate hormone" as suggested by the Examiner. Again, these amendments should not be construed to indicate that Applicants acquiesce in the rejection. In light of these amendments, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By Lisa M. Treannie

Lisa M. Treannie

Registration No. 41,368

Telephone: (978) 341-0036

Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133

Dated: October 2, 2003